

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 17 2008

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

New claims 30 and 31 are the same as previous claims 1 and 24 respectively except that the "non-colorless fluid" has been changed to an "inherently non-colorless fluid" to distinguish it from a fluid which has color due to added dye or pigment. New claims 32, 33, 34 are the same as claims 11, 28 and 29 respectively, except for their dependency on new claims 30 or 31.

In response to the allowance with objections to claims 3, 5-10, 13-23, and 25-27, claims 3, 5-7, 10, 13, 18 and 22 have been rewritten in independent form incorporating all the limitations of the claims on which they previously depended, so that the objections to claims 3, 5-10, 13-23, and 25-27 is now moot. The amendment of claims 3, 5-7, 10, 13, 18 and 22 are not statutorily required, and applicant preserves the doctrine of equivalence for all these claims.

Claims 6 and 26 have been amended to correct grammatical errors and not for any statutory reasons. Claim 27 has been amended because an obvious typographical error in the preliminary amendment eliminated the dependence on claim 24.

In response to the rejection of claims 6, 26 and 27 under 35 USC sec. 112, for insufficient antecedent basis, there is no statutory requirement for antecedent basis of claims. Prior to the amendment the claims were particular and distinct and therefore the amendments were not statutorily required, and applicant preserves the doctrine of equivalence for all these claims.

In response to the rejection of claim 24 under 35 USC sec. 102, for allegedly being anticipated by US5684637 to Floyd, the amended claim is not anticipated.

More specifically, claim 27 is dependent on claim 24 which is the examiner has already found is not anticipated by Floyd.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 11-12, 24, and 28-29, under 35 USC 103, allegedly for being unobvious over US6702483 to Tsuboi in view of Floyd, the combination does not render the claims unobvious.

More specifically the combination of citations does not suggest "means for correcting for a colour change which would otherwise occur in an image of an object compared with the object itself as a result of said non-colourless fluid" as in claim 1 on which all the other rejected claims depend. Neither Floyd nor Tsuboi suggest "correcting for a colour change which would otherwise occur in an image of an object compared with the object itself as a result of said non-colourless fluid". The colored fluid of Floyd does not perform that function.

All the claims are particular and distinct and novel and unobvious and applicant hereby respectfully requests allowance of all the claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) including fees for any required extension of time, to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Attorney
(914) 333-9643